

1955

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

10733

sharpen the desire and transformed keen disappointments into increasingly grim determination. Organizationally it was inspiring to find stout hearts aplenty and willing hands ever ready to close ranks and carry on the crusade. Many of the noblest have gone on to their eternal reward while many others will never enjoy the benefits they worked so hard to secure. In Heaven or on earth they rejoice with us. For many of us when the end of a long, long trail was reached a stunning joy and elation became mixed with many nostalgic memories and choked emotions.

In grateful appreciation we should long remember:

President Eisenhower for his insistence, emphasized by two vetoes, that the principle of equal pay for equal work was a must in any pay bill in order to be acceptable.

Postmaster General Summerfield for making our fight his fight all the way and his limitless courage when the going was the toughest.

Chairman Tom MURRAY for his unwavering stand and masterful handling of the reclassification measures in the turbulent committee meetings and on the House floor where he was so ably assisted by Congressman Ed REES.

And don't forget a special thank you for the Post Office Department staff headed by Deputy Postmaster General Hook and Assistant Postmasters General Abrams and Lyons whose genius for organization and passion for detail did such a terrific job in the development and promotion of the salary program.

At a quickly arranged celebration at the Mayflower Hotel, I endeavored, not too successfully, I am sure, to convey the association's appreciation to Postmaster General Summerfield and his staff and such Congressmen and Senators that on short notice honored us by attending. To President Eisenhower, I sent the following telegram:

"In grateful appreciation for the realization of our most cherished objective—reclassification of postal salaries on the basis of equal pay for equal work—permit me to voice a thunderous 'thank you' from the hearts of 20,000 postal supervisors. The Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 is important legislation, but even more important is the fact your leadership renewed faith in the traditions of fair play and simple justice, which are held so dear in the hearts of all Americans. May God bless you and keep you ever faithful to your high ideals and trust."

But each in your own way can do a much better job, I am sure, of expressing your own gratitude and appreciation to each and every one of these men and the host of others which took up the cudgels in your behalf. It should be a must. And a labor of love for the auxiliary, too.

In the same issue, he was joined by J. V. Horton, the legislative representative of the Association, who said:

From every viewpoint, the new law is an excellent one, with provisions for supervisors for which we have striven for many years. Its real merit will be fully realized when the reclassification becomes effective late next fall and the bigger pay checks begin to fill your pockets. All supervisors owe a great debt of gratitude to President Eisenhower, the Postmaster General and his staff, and to Senators FRANK CARLSON and OLIN D. JOHNSON, and Congressman Tom MURRAY and EDWARD H. REES, for their persistence in championing the cause of the postal supervisors and insisting on a fair and equitable law, with reclassification, based on the principle of "equal pay for equal work, higher pay for greater responsibility," and containing a real incentive for all employees, including supervisors, to seek more difficult jobs which carry higher pay.

Why not show that appreciation now, by writing a simple letter to President Eisenhower and to Mr. Summerfield and the Members of Congress who did so well by you, expressing your gratitude. They would really like to know that you appreciate their cooperation in giving you a fair and equitable salary law.

The National League of Postmasters consists mostly of postmasters in the smaller offices throughout the country. In the July edition of their magazine the Postmasters' Advocate, their president, Lawrence P. Jones, made the following statement:

The enactment of the Postal Field Service Compensation Act of 1955 came just at the time the Postmasters' Advocate was going to press last month, making it impossible for me to have time to prepare comments regarding this all-important legislation. However, it is never too late to publicly thank anyone for a job well done, and certainly we owe our appreciation and gratitude to those who have worked so long and hard to get this historical piece of legislation passed.

To the Postmaster General and officials of the Department, to the Senate and House Post Office and Civil Service Committees, the National League of Postmasters is grateful for the opportunity to have worked with you on legislation which wipes out the injustice and inequities of the past and restores incentive to the postal field.

We feel that for the first time the postmasters of this country are the recipients of a just pay system. The league for a long time has studied and expended proper effort to help obtain legislation which would remedy the situation. We are very pleased with the annual increase provision of Public Law 68 for this is a piece of legislation we have especially wanted and worked for for years.

We know that important strides have been made in correcting many of the ills that have plagued the postal service, and that there are many more problems yet to be overcome, but with understanding, sincerity of purpose, and cooperation these too will be rectified.

The National League of Postmasters pledges to the Postmaster General and the Post Office Department our continued efforts in behalf of a better postal service.

Mr. President, it is my considered opinion that once this new, modern, and forward-looking postal-pay legislation is understood by postal employees, and once the benefits they receive therefrom are realized, this legislation will receive the widespread endorsement of the fine group of men and women who so capably serve their fellow Americans by the expeditious delivery of the mails.

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1956—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7278) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of July 29, 1955, pp. 10460-10461, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 7278, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U. S.,
July 30, 1955.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 19, 20, 28, 29, 34, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 43, 48, 49, 50, 58, 59, 61, 64, 78, 80, 82, 83, 85, 86, 88, 89, 92, 95, 98, 117, 127, 128, 130, 131, 142, and 143 to the bill (H. R. 7278) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1956, and for other purposes, and concur therein.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 3, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$250,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 22, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the first sum named in said amendment insert "\$100,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 23, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the second sum named in said amendment insert "\$225,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 25, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the first sum named in said amendment insert "\$500,000", and in lieu of the last sum named in said amendment insert "\$4,750,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 27, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the first sum named in said amendment insert "\$2,000,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 31, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$485,077,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 33, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$442,628,300."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 35, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
"MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, AIR FORCE

"For an additional amount for acquisition, construction, installation, and equipment of temporary or permanent public works, military installations, and facilities for the Air Force as authorized by the act of September 11, 1950 (Public Law 783), the act of September 28, 1951 (Public Law 155), the act of July 14, 1952 (Public Law 534), the act of August 7, 1953 (Public Law 209), the act of April 1, 1954 (Public Law 325), the act of July 27, 1954 (Public Law 534), the act of September 1, 1954 (Public Law 765), and the act of July 15, 1955 (Public Law 161), without regard to sections 1136 and 3734, Revised Statutes, as amended; including hire of passenger motor vehicles, including research and development facilities at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base,

10734

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

July 30

Dayton, Ohio; to remain available until expended, \$994,291,000 of which \$255,000,000 shall be derived by transfer from the appropriation "Procurement and production, Army": *Provided*, That not to exceed \$350,000 of this appropriation shall be used for the purposes authorized by section 303 of the act of July 15, 1955 (Public Law 161)."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 56, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

"SITES AND PLANNING, PURCHASE CONTRACTS, AND PUBLIC BUILDINGS PROJECTS"

"For expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions of the Public Buildings Purchase Contract Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 518), \$15 million, to remain available until expended and to be in addition to and available for the same purposes as any unobligated balances which have been or may be made available, by any law enacted during the 1st session of the 84th Congress, for carrying out the purposes of said act: *Provided*, That any such unobligated balances may be consolidated with this appropriation."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 75, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

**"NATIONAL SECURITY TRAINING COMMISSION
"Salaries and expenses"**

"For necessary expenses of the National Security Training Commission, including services as authorized by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (5 U. S. C. 55a), at rates for individuals not in excess of \$50 per diem, and contracts with temporary or part-time employees may be renewed annually; and expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the purposes of this appropriation; \$40,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 76, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by said amendment insert:

**"SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM
"Salaries and expenses"**

"Not to exceed \$180,000 of the amount made available under this head in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1950, for registration, classification, and induction activities of local boards, shall be available during the current fiscal year for expenses of the National Advisory Committee on the Selection of Physicians, Dentists, and Allied Specialists, including not to exceed \$30,000 for expenses of travel."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 84, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$120,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 93, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$1,500,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 104, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$30,000,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 109, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$90,000,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 116, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,000,000."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment numbered 123, and

concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$5,000,000."

That the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 3, 22, 23, 25, 27, 31, 33, 35, 56, 75, 76, 84, 93, 104, 109, 116, and 123.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. I move that the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 62.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Is this the conference report which involves more than \$2 million for a transmission line at The Dalles, Oreg., which line is necessary if the Harvey Aluminum Co. is to be able to operate a plant at The Dalles?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. The House would not agree to appropriate money for that line. There is nothing in the bill for that purpose. The Senate placed the item in the bill, but the House would not agree to accept it. The House Members are not satisfied as to exactly what those who propose to build the aluminum plant intend to do, and they desire to learn more about the subject. They wish to know whether there is any certainty that the plant will be built.

Mr. MORSE. I think the record is very clear as to what the Harvey Aluminum Co. proposes to do. It has been trying to get power from the Bonneville Power Administration so that it can build this plant and provide some very much needed competition in the field of aluminum production. The company cannot build the plant until it can have assurance that it will have power. The Bonneville Power Administration requires the money to build the transmission line. I think it is very clear in the record that the money would not be spent unless the company went ahead and built a plant.

Mr. HAYDEN. We pointed that out in our report. It was directed that the money should not be spent unless the Government was thoroughly satisfied that the Harvey Co. would build an aluminum plant.

A statement has been made which is not quite clear to me. It is said that on a former occasion the same company had indicated that it would build an aluminum plant in Montana, I believe, and then had sold out to someone else. I do not know the facts in that connection.

Mr. MORSE. It is very difficult for me to understand the House attitude. Here is a company ready and willing to build a plant to give us the aluminum production we need and to give us something else that we need in the aluminum industry, and that is competition.

The taxpayers would not lose a single cent on this item, because not a cent would be spent unless the plant were built. There are powerful economic forces which would like to see this plant

not built. But we are spending the money of all the taxpayers of the United States for the development of power resources across the Nation. Unless we make use of the power resources, once they are developed, we shall throw the entire power program into disrepute.

Mr. HAYDEN. We were in a situation involving an appropriation bill containing many items. Everyone was anxious to get the bill through. The House conferees were adamant. They would not accept the item. We had no choice but to yield.

Mr. MORSE. I understand the Senator's position. I am about through making my record.

We are not through with this subject. Another day is coming. I want the record to show very clearly two things.

First, I think the Harvey Aluminum Co. has been very fair and frank with us. It has been urging the Bonneville Power Administration to provide it with the necessary power. The Bonneville Power Administration cannot furnish the power without the transmission line.

As the Senator from Arizona has pointed out, no money would be spent under this item until the plant was built. I think that is a very fair position for the company to take, for the Bonneville Power Administration to take, and for the Senate to take.

Secondly, I wish to make it clear that I think it is very important that we bring competition into this industry. I can well imagine that there are economic forces in this country which would like to keep the Harvey Aluminum Co. out of the Dalles region. Nevertheless, from the standpoint of the best economic interests of the people—not of my State alone, but of the Nation—we should have competition in this industry. We are spending the taxpayers' money to develop great electric power resources. I think they ought to be used to strengthen competition, and not to strengthen monopoly.

The monopolistic problem is involved in connection with this project. I am keenly disappointed that the House would not go along; but I also say that we intend to meet this problem in the future. I shall continue to press for competition in the aluminum industry in my section of the country.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I wish to express my agreement with my senior colleague from Oregon on the question of eliminating funds for the transmission line to The Dalles, Oreg., to serve the proposed Harvey Aluminum Co. plant.

I wish to invite the attention of Senators to an anomalous and ironic situation. To begin with, I realize full well that the elimination of this item was not made with the acquiescence or approval of the distinguished Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. Not at all. This is the second time the Senate has approved an appropriation to construct such a transmission line.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I realize that, and I give full credit to the distinguished Senator from Arizona for what he has

1955

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

10735

done to try to have this item included in the bill.

One of the things which seems very strange and disturbing to me is this: A recent story in the New York Times business section pointed out that the vast Aluminum Co. of Canada is about to expand its plant in Kitimat, British Columbia, twice, in a series of two jumps, ahead of schedule capacity, so that it can sell aluminum to the United States, to meet the current American demand for

If we believe in employment of our own people and development of our own industrial potential, it seems ironic that we should eliminate a relatively small item, of slightly more than \$2 million, to serve a great aluminum plant in the United States, while an aluminum smelter in British Columbia is to be expanded twice in the next few years to meet the demand of American consumers and American industries for aluminum.

Also, I hope the Senator from Arizona realizes that the State of Oregon has had one of the greatest proportional population gains in the Nation in recent years. We are having a hard time keeping some of our people at work. In fact, between the years 1952 and 1954 our State has had one of the largest percentage reductions in income-tax collections of any State in the Union. That has created a critical economic situation, and the development of our hydroelectric power for new employment is therefore very important.

As indicated by the Senator's studies of the problem, aluminum offers a great opportunity for putting these people to work to produce the items which are necessary to all the people of the country. It will also result in more employment as secondary industries come in to fabricate this aluminum.

For that reason, plus the ironic fact that we are buying aluminum from Canada, when we could produce it ourselves on the banks of the Columbia River, makes me share the disappointment felt by my senior colleague that the item was eliminated from the appropriation bill.

I thank the Senator from Arizona for all he has done. I am sure he shares our disappointment and regret over what has occurred.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I not only associate myself with the remarks made by my distinguished junior colleague, but I wish to raise a point for the Record, so that it may be shown that notice is being given that this company may be in the legal position where it can bring suit against the Government because of the contract for power which has been entered into. I cannot decide that question today. However, I believe the company should go ahead and build its plant, to show its good faith. It ought to proceed to make whatever commitments are necessary to be made, so that the question cannot be raised later that the company has not shown good faith. I am for that. I do not want anyone to think that I am making a plea for the Harvey Aluminum Co. unless the Harvey Alu-

minum Co. takes such legal steps as will put it in such a position that it will be bound and delivered.

On the other hand, the Government has no right to expect the Harvey Aluminum Co. to spend the huge sums of money which it will be necessary to spend for the building of the plant, unless it can count on the Government to deliver power to it.

Mr. HAYDEN. The fact that there was a contract which may have been breached because of which the aluminum company might have a claim against the United States came to the attention of the conferees.

Mr. MORSE. The fact that it will be 2½ years before we can get power at the Dalles Dam means we still have an opportunity to get this matter into shape. However, I think that in this matter time is fast becoming of the essence. I wish to make it clear that between now and when the next bill comes before the Senate we will investigate the matter, so that we will then be able to present such a legal commitment that no one in the House will be able to raise a question as to good faith.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. NEUBERGER. In the first place, am I correct in understanding that the item for the transmission lines to The Dalles to serve the proposed Harvey plant was not included in the original administration budget?

Mr. HAYDEN. No; it was not.

Mr. NEUBERGER. In all candor, why does the distinguished Senator from Arizona believe that the conferees on the part of the House made such a point about eliminating the item?

Mr. HAYDEN. I did not inquire as to what their motives were. They simply said they could not take it at this time and would not take it. The Senate conferees could do nothing about it.

Mr. NEUBERGER. There was absolutely no chance at all of getting the House conferees to yield on that point, was there?

Mr. HAYDEN. No. They were adamant. They would not take it at this time. They said if it were made a part of a regular appropriation bill they would take a look at it, but they would not consider it on a supplemental appropriation bill.

Mr. NEUBERGER. When a regular appropriation bill is considered next year, will the able Senator make every effort to add a provision for the construction of the transmission lines which are so badly needed?

Mr. HAYDEN. I am satisfied that, our committee having twice recommended the provision, it is most likely that it will do it a third time. That is all I can say.

COMPACT FOR APPORTIONMENT OF WATERS OF RED RIVER

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2260) granting the consent of Congress to the States of Arkansas, Louisiana, Okla-

homa, and Texas to negotiate and enter into a compact relating to their interests in, and the apportionment of, the waters of the Red River and its tributaries, which were, on page 1, line 5, strike out all after "compact" down to and including "and" where it appears the second time in line 7; on page 1, line 9, strike out "and for matters incident thereto.", and to amend the title so as to read: "An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, and Texas to negotiate and enter into a compact providing for the apportionment of the waters of the Red River and its tributaries."

Mr. KERR. The amendments made by the House do not impair the bill, but leave it so that the objective for which it was intended can be attained. Therefore I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR].

The motion was agreed to.

MAINTENANCE OF ORDER IN THE SENATE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. STENNIS in the chair). The Chair calls the attention of the membership of the Senate to the fact that the Senate has a large amount of business which it is trying to transact this afternoon and tonight. The Chair wishes everyone in the Chamber to pay attention, because he may be affected by what the Chair is about to say.

The Chair knows that there are many matters to which Senators must attend. They must confer with one another.

Furthermore, there are many reasons why administrative assistants, committee clerks, and committee assistants should be in the Chamber. It may be that the Senate cannot transact its business without them. But conditions have reached such a point that the Senate cannot possibly transact its business with them present unless they maintain order.

There is so much confusion, and so much laughing and talking, among those who are exercising the privilege of the floor, that the Senate can hardly transact its business, as the Chair has said.

Earlier this morning, in coming down the aisle of the Senate to make a report from the Committee on Armed Services, I had to go around two clerks in the aisle. While I was attempting to speak, an administrative assistant came up and touched one of these clerks on the shoulder and began to talk to him. I took no offense at that; I simply cite it as an illustration.

The rule pertaining to the privilege of the floor begins:

No person shall be admitted to the floor of the Senate while in session, except as follows.

In other words, the main rule is a prohibition against being on the floor. Among the exceptions are:

Clerks to Senate committees and clerks to Senators when in the actual discharge of their official duties.

10736

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

July 30

Such persons have no right to be on the floor unless they are actually in the discharge of their official duties. The rule does not refer to my official duties or to some other Senator's, but to the official duties of clerks.

The Chair is not challenging the right of anyone to be in the Chamber, but if there is not better behavior, the Chair will let some of those concerned come to the bar of the Senate and state their official business. Then the Senate can pass on whether or not those persons are entitled to the privilege of the floor. We will ask for the person's name. While he may not make a speech, he may state his name to the clerk, who will pass it up to the Presiding Officer. The Presiding Officer will then read it to the Senate for the benefit of the record, and a permanent record will be made of exactly what business that person has in the Senate this afternoon.

I wish to give fair warning that so long as the junior Senator from Mississippi is acting as the Presiding Officer, and until he is overruled by the Senate, that will be the ruling of the Chair.

If anyone does not understand the warning, let him not complain later. That will be the order.

The Chair thinks that there should be a good showing of manners when assistants are in the Chamber on official business. If one's business is not being considered, it is good manners to vacate the floor or to wait in a place convenient to the assistant and his Senator until his business actually can be considered.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I could not commend one more than I now commend the Presiding Officer for the observations he has just made. I take it that anyone on the floor at the present time recognizes whether or not he comes under the rule which was read by the Presiding Officer. If he does not, I assume he will take due notice of what the Presiding Officer has said.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I want the Presiding Officer to know that he has bipartisan support in the statement which he has made. I think the admonition will be helpful in the closing hours of the session, because the Senate is working under great stress and great strain. We are dealing with legislation which affects our citizens, affairs at home, and perhaps affairs abroad as well.

It would be very easy for an amendment to be offered or adopted, or a bill to be introduced, which the Senate did not fully understand if Senators could not even hear the presentation made by the Senator who offered or spoke on an amendment or a bill.

So far as the minority leader is concerned, he will fully support the ruling of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Presiding Officer wishes to thank the floor leaders, and he thanks them on behalf of the membership.

SALARIES OF GOVERNORS OF THE STATES AND TERRITORIES

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed

at this point in the body of the Record a tabulation of the salaries of the governors of the 48 States and the several Territories, and their names.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Governors of the States and Territories

State or Territory	Governor	Salary
Alabama	James E. Folsom	\$12,000
Arizona	Ernest W. McFarland	\$15,000
Arkansas	Orval F. Furber	\$10,000
California	Goodwin J. Knight	\$25,000
Colorado	Ed C. Johnson	\$17,500
Connecticut	Abraham A. Ribicoff	\$15,000
Delaware	J. Caleb Roper	\$12,000
Florida	LeRoy Collins	\$15,000
Georgia	McEver G. Griffin	\$12,000
Idaho	Robert F. Smythe	\$10,000
Illinois	William B. Stratton	\$25,000
Indiana	George N. Craig	\$15,000
Iowa	Leo A. Busch	\$12,000
Kansas	Fred Hall	\$15,000
Kentucky	Lewis W. Wetherby	\$10,000
Louisiana	Robert F. Kennedy	\$18,000
Maine	Edmund S. Muskie	\$10,000
Maryland	Theodore R. McKeldin	\$15,000
Massachusetts	Christian A. Herter	\$20,000
Michigan	G. Mennen Williams	\$22,500
Minnesota	Orville L. Freeman	\$15,000
Mississippi	Hugh L. White	\$15,000
Missouri	Phil M. Donnelly	\$10,000
Montana	Clifton Aronson	\$10,000
Nebraska	Arthur E. Anderson	\$10,000
Nevada	Charles H. Russell	\$7,000
New Hampshire	Samuel Davis	\$12,000
New Jersey	Robert R. Meyner	\$30,000
New Mexico	John F. Shuman	\$15,000
New York	Avard Fairman	\$50,000
North Carolina	Lawton H. Hughes	\$15,000
North Dakota	Norman Brunsdale	\$9,000
Ohio	Frank J. Lausche	\$20,000
Oklahoma	Raymond Gary	\$15,000
Oregon	Paul Patterson	\$11,000
Pennsylvania	George M. Leader	\$25,000
Rhode Island	Dennis F. Roberts	\$15,000
South Carolina	George B. Tammerman	\$15,000
South Dakota	Joe J. Foss	\$9,500
Tennessee	Frank G. Clement	\$12,000
Texas	Alan Shivers	\$12,000
Utah	J. Bracken Lee	\$10,000
Vermont	Joseph B. Johnson	\$11,000
Virginia	Thomas B. Stanley	\$17,500
Washington	Arthur B. Langlie	\$15,000
West Virginia	William C. Marland	\$12,500
Wisconsin	Walter J. Kohler	\$14,000
Wyoming	Walter J. Simpson	\$12,000
Puerto Rico	Esteban Morán	\$10,000
Alaska	W. Frank Hartzman	\$15,000
Guam	Earl G. Ebeling	\$13,125
Hawaii	Samuel W. King	\$16,000
American Samoa	Richard Barrett Lowe	
Virgin Islands	Arthur A. Alexander	\$15,000

* Use of executive mansion and fund for maintenance and expenses.

† Executive mansion furnished.

‡ No executive mansion; nominal appropriation for expenses.

Mr. BENDER subsequently said: Mr. President, the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] placed in the Record a moment ago a list of the Governors of the States and Territories, together with their salaries. I wonder if there was included in that list the amount of money appropriated for each Governor for his personal use, as well as which Governors are furnished with a Governor's mansion, and money for other expenses.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, what I placed in the Record is a matter of information to the Senate. If the Senator from Ohio will examine the list, he will see that it contains a series of footnotes, which indicate Governors who have the use of an executive mansion and a fund for its maintenance and expenses, Governors who have an executive mansion furnished, and Governors who have no executive mansion furnished but receive a nominal appropriation for expenses. I have no precise

memory of what is furnished in that respect, but the list indicates that the Governors are furnished at least with expenses, if not with a mansion.

Mr. BENDER. I think most of the Governors of the States are grossly underpaid. I know of one or two—and I would be glad to give the names to the Senator privately—who I think are overpaid, but generally the Governors are underpaid.

PAYMENT OF SALARY OF A COMMISSIONER FOR THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1213, Senate bill 2671.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2671) to authorize the Atomic Energy Commission to pay the salary of a Commissioner during the recess of the Senate, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I do not intend to take any time on the bill, S. 2671, unless there are questions, but I do wish to say the bill was reported unanimously from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, Admiral Strauss, has already flown to Geneva. One other member of the Commission, Dr. Libby, plans to leave for Geneva on Friday night. That leaves Commissioner Murray and Dr. von Neumann, but not a quorum to do business. The President of the United States might decide to appoint a Commissioner, but under the present situation he could not be paid for his services, since the vacancy has existed for more than 30 days. It obviously would not be proper to appoint only a person who because he had sufficient wealth would not care whether he was paid or not paid.

The Atomic Energy Commission sent to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy a proposal covering this subject. We have decided to report the bill to the Senate. It provides that the President of the United States, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, may name a commissioner to serve, and that such commissioner may draw pay until the Senate meets again, and 40 days thereafter. That would give the Senate time enough to make an investigation and report on the nomination.

Furthermore, the bill contains a provision that all commissioners shall receive full information. That provision is proposed because one of the President's projects revealed that all information was not being furnished to all the commissioners. I am convinced that was not a result of decision by any one commissioner, but because it was not the responsibility of any of the employees to make sure that all commissioners were advised.